Packet-Radio Digest   Sat, 21 Aug 93   Volume 93 : Issue 246

Today's Topics:
                        Digital Hierarchy
                     Packet drivers for a TNC
             Sending packet with Fax modem possible?
                          TheNET X1J ?!
                     Tiny-2 + The Net 2.10??

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 19 Aug 93 06:42:03 GMT
From: rtech!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Digital Hierarchy
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

[Followups to rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc]

ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:
>Of course, the question will be(consider this a preview of what the
>discussion will look like in news.groups when this RFD gets cranking in a
>few months): is there sufficient traffic to justify the new groups?

Yeah, agreed. When you propose a new newsgroup, you need to *know* that
you're putting your proposal out to some very skeptical masses that could,
and probably will, tear it apart. Of course, I'm not saying that's bad - the
net would be a big mess (well, bigger mess than it is :-) if it wasn't
difficult to make a new newsgroup.

>Obviously, there will be another try at creation of rrad.tcpip. Based
>on what I've seen recently, rrad.packet will probably be in the running
>also. But is there really enough RTTY, AMTOR, or PACTOR traffic on here to
>justify a separate newsgroup for them? In the end, I think they will be
>left to rrad.misc until enough long-term traffic shows up to justify
>creating separate groups.

I also would not be surprised if another try is made at r.r.a.d.tcpip. But
there was already quite a bit of resistance at moving the r.r.a.packet to
r.r.a.d.misc. I'll go with the flow on a r.r.a.d.packet but I would not
look forward to the mess that will cause with the mail lists again.

Anyway, it's still a long way off. Ben mentioned this but I'll expand on it.
r.r.a.d.tcpip failed the last vote so it has to wait 6 months before anyone
can try again. That will be January 1, 1994 for the earliest possible
posting of a Request for Discussion (RFD). Assuming that goes well, it will
be 21-30 days before voting can begin, which would also be 21-30 days. So,
no matter how enthusiastic anyone is for it, it can't happen before February
or March of next year. So be patient... let's properly settle into the new
groups we just got before jumping to make more.

If anyone's interested, I'd expect that the initial discussion for an RFD will
happen on the "rec.radio.amateur working group" mail list - a collection of
the volunteers who post periodic informational articles & FAQs, the moderator
of rec.radio.info, some ARRL staff, and other regular participants in the
rec.radio.amateur newsgroups. If you think you'd like to be a part of it
or just watch, it's always open for you to join. Just send a message to
rra-wg-request@amdahl.com and ask to join the list. Don't forget to include
your callsign so you can be properly introduced to the group.
--
Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL   Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com   Santa Clara, CA
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

Date: 20 Aug 93 21:27:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Packet drivers for a TNC
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

I would like to hook up my TNC to my computer using a packet driver
instead of use NOS. Has any one seen a packet driver for a TNC.

Tom Fleming
N9SZF

Date: Fri, 20 Aug 1993 15:50:41 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!olivea!
grapevine.lcs.mit.edu!lynx!j.perry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Sending packet with Fax modem possible?
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

I was just reading my fax modem manual (class 1) and came across a fax
command that was described as sending data in an HDLC frame. Seems to me
that is the same frame type used for packet radio...got me thinking is
it possible to use this to send packet....it's a long-shot I think but
I figured I would ask.

Jeff

Date: 19 Aug 93 13:38:47 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: TheNET X1J ?!
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc, dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:

>In article <PME.93Aug10205158@gaia.electrum.kth.se> pme@gaia.electrum.kth.se
>(Peter Enderborg) writes:

>> Where do I find TheNet X1J version? Archie do not find it.

>Probably because it hasn't been officially released yet! When I get a copy,
>I will put it on ftp.demon.co.uk and stick a post in this group about it.

Dave,

    Yes, PLEASE DO! Many of us want to get a copy ASAP!

    Thanks, OM!

CUL es 73 de BB

 """
 Brian Battles, WS1O   I Tel   203-666-1541, ext 222 I "Radio amateurs
 QST Features Editor   I Fax   203-665-7531   I   do it with
 ARRL HQ   I Internet bbattles@arrl.org   I   high frequency"
 Newington, CT USA   I Amprnet ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org   I
 """

I have two Tiny-2's to piggyback with The Net 2.10. Made a suitable
cable and took them to the remote site, but did not test the two TNCs.
One appeared to work perfectly. The other had illuminated STA and CON
lights immediately on turn on. I changed program switch on the back
to the optional program and it seemed better. Question, is it possible
the two chips were programmed with different locations on the 512 EPROM?
Both my local sources are mystified, including the fellow who burned
the chips.
73, DAve

End of Packet-Radio Digest V93 #246
****